

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification is amended; claim 3 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1, 11 and 19 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 8-17, 19 are 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over He et al. (U.S. Patent 6,737,358). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

He et al. cannot anticipate claim 1 as He et al. do not disclose or suggest a lithographic projection apparatus comprising a radiation system configured to provide a beam radiation; a support configured to support a patterning device, the patterning device configured to pattern a beam according to a desired pattern.

He et al. disclose a plasma etching system 100 including a plasma reaction chamber 102 into which gas is provided by a distribution channel 128 to form a plasma 116 above a substrate 106. The plasma etching system of He et al. does not include a radiation system configured to provide a beam radiation or a support configured to support a patterning device or a patterning device to pattern the beam according to a desired pattern. Accordingly, He et al. cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1.

Claims 2, 4 and 8-17 recite additional features of the invention and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 19 recites a device manufacturing method comprising providing a beam of radiation using a radiation system and patterning the beam and projecting the patterned beam onto a target portion of a layer of radiation-sensitive material at least partially covering a substrate.

As discussed above, the plasma etching system of He et al. does not include a radiation system that provides a beam of radiation, nor does He et al. disclose patterning the beam of radiation or projecting the pattern onto a target portion of a layer of radiation-sensitive material. Accordingly, He et al. cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 19.

Claim 20 recites additional features of the invention and is allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 19 and for the additional features recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal over He et al. are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,225,032). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 3, which the Examiner acknowledges are not disclosed or suggest by Hasegawa et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 4 and 12-18 recite additional features of the invention and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 19 recites that the space through which the beam passes comprises the composition and contains at least the portion of the radiation system.

There is no disclosure or suggestion by Hasegawa et al. of a space containing either the laser 10 or the projection optical system 15 that contains a composition. Accordingly, Hasegawa et al. cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 19.

Claim 20 recites additional features of the invention and is allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 19 and for the additional features recited therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection over Hasegawa et al. are respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 recite additional features of the invention and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that McGinnis et al. and Kanekiyo et al. (U.S. Patent 5,320,707) each fail to cure the deficiencies of He et al. with respect to claim 1 and that even assuming it would have been obvious to combine the references, which Applicants do not concede, such combination would not have resulted in the invention of claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections over He et al. in view of McGinnis et al. or Kanekiyo et al. are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are allowable and that the entire application is condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP


JOHN P. DARLING
Reg. No. 44482
Tel. No. 703 770.7745
Fax No. 703 770.7901

Date: March 6, 2006

P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
Tel. No. 703 770.7900